

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

277 SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314TELEPHONE: 17031 836-6400  
FACSIMILE: 17031 836-2787  
E-MAIL: O&B@OLIFF.COM  
WWW.OLIFF.COM

January 22, 2004

**U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET**

<p>To: In re the Application of <b>Masaaki IMAI</b></p> <p>Application No.: 09/277,373</p> <p>Filed: March 29, 1999</p> <p>For: DEVICE FOR REWRITING SOFTWARE PROGRAMS IN PERIPHERAL DEVICES CONNECTED TO A NETWORK</p>	<p><b>U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE</b></p> <p>Group Art Unit: 2122</p> <p>Docket No.: 103014</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Examiner: C. KENDALL Facsimile: (703) 746-5533From: KEVIN M. MCKINLEYPrepared By: jfb Number of Pages Sent (Including cover sheet): 2**Comments:**

Please see the attachment regarding the above-identified application.

Sent by: \_\_\_\_\_

This facsimile is intended only for the use of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and contains confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this facsimile is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by facsimile or telephone, and return the facsimile to us by mail at the above address.

Examiner Kendall, I apologize for not getting this over to you earlier. Below is a proposed discussion during the interview this afternoon at 2PM.

The applied art does not teach a first rewrite unit that when an old/new judgment unit judges that the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device is older than the software stored in the memory, rewrites the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral into the software program stored in the memory and a second rewrite unit that, when the old/new judgment unit judges that the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device is newer than the software stored in the memory, rewrites the software program stored in the memory into the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device, as claimed in claim 1 and similarly claimed in claims 6, 12 and 17.

Instead, Otto discloses revision of information stored in the various level nodes in which the information stored in the upper level node is sent to the lower level node for revision or update purposes. However, the information stored in the lower level node is not sent to the upper level node for revision or update purposes. Particularly, Otto discloses a system for distributing updates to nodes of a hierarchical communications network that cascade the updates through the network as a function of its hierarchy (col. 1, lines 16-20). In Otto a first node functions as a server for the second node and the second node functions as a server for the third node and in the hierarchical structure, particular levels have control or precedence over other levels. In particular, in Otto, the status reporting circuitry associated with the second node collects and transmits the current status of the second node to first node (in the hierarchical/tree-based or flat network). The information revising circuitry associated with the first node then receives the current stats of the second nodes and determines whether a revision of the second node information is required. If revision of the second node is required, the first node transmits the revision to the second node (col. 2, lines 24-44).